UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

		CIVIL WIINU	IES - GENERAL			
Case No.	CV 15-150-S	SVW-PLA		Date	January 13, 2015	
Title	Matthew 01	tthew 01 Investment, LLC v. Sharyl Bloom, et al				
JS - 6						
Present: The Honorable		STEPHEN V. WILSON, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE				
Paul M.		Cruz	N/A			
Deputy		Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder			
Attorneys Prese		ent for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:			
N		/A		N/A		
Proceedings: IN		CHAMBERS ORDER REMANDING THE CASE TO STATE COURT				
Generally, removal jurisdiction is disfavored. <i>Gaus v. Miles, Inc.</i> , 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992). But it is proper if the case could have been filed in federal court originally. 28 U.S.C. § 1441; <i>Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. v. Henson</i> , 537 U.S. 28, 33 (2002). The removing party bears the burden of establishing subject-matter jurisdiction. <i>Gaus</i> , 980 F.2d at 566. Defendants premised removal on federal question jurisdiction. (Doc. 1, Notice of Removal). According to the well-pleaded complaint rule, a federal question must inhere from the plaintiff's claims for relief. <i>ARCO Envtl. Remediation, LLC v. Dept. of Health and Envtl. Quality</i> , 213 F.3d 1108, 113 (9th Cir. 2000). This case, however, is an unlawful detainer action governed by California law, and it raises no apparent issues of federal law. Therefore, the Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over this case and must remand it to state court. In its notice of removal, defendants alleged that their defenses — not the plaintiff's claims — raise federal questions. (Doc. 1, Notice of Removal). But their defenses, like the underlying claims, sound in state law. Moreover, removal would be improper even if their defenses implicated federal law, for a "case may not be removed to federal court on the basis of a federal defense." <i>Franchise Tax Bd. v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust</i> , 463 U.S. 1, 14 (1983). Defendants failed to carry their burden of establishing subject-matter jurisdiction. Therefore, the Court <i>sua sponte</i> REMANDS this case to the California Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles.						
			Initials of Prepar	rer	PMC	